

The Development of Game Analysis

Oswald Summerton

Abstract

Without in-depth game analysis, transactional analysis may become an empty shell of people saying, and sincerely believing, "I'm OK and you. . . ." The author's introduction to game analysis began with the colloquial names of games and then with learning ways to discover the content of hidden messages. There followed the stopper to any play of a game: "Feel anything and refuse the payoff." Gradually came the realization that even the "heroes" of transactional analysis—analysts who were certified—played games. The author went on a journey to experience and understand the roller-coaster quality of organizational as well as individual games. The inner journey to unconscious, dishonest psychodynamics and then outward to unconsciously dishonest communication may lead the adventurer to name the hidden evil of what parades as dishonesty in a good cause.

The approach of our third millennium was characterized by many forebodings and predictions, but it actually began without the expected planetary "bang." Did anything really change besides the calendars and clocks? People continued and will continue to play games, both unconscious (transactional) ones and conscious (exploitative) ones. The end of the second millennium should include in its memorabilia material about Eric Berne's discovery of three ego states; his invention of a psychological tool kit, especially game analysis; the numerous loose ends left in his research; and the growth of game analysis through the work of his followers.

In this article my main focus is the development of Berne's thought from his first transactional analysis of a game to his final description of what constituted a game. Another focus is what I call a special quality of

transactional analysis, namely, the catalyzing of creativity in transactional analysts. This has resulted in discoveries of multiple ways of identifying the hidden elements of socially acceptable games. Although games may seem trite and commonplace, their disclosure sometimes results in an experience of immediacy or mystery and disbelief, and at the same time, the awareness can lead to avoiding destructive, interpersonal communication both with other humans and with the divine.

My Introduction to Games

The first scene is rural Bihar in India in 1964. Walking into the staff common room, my friend Kevin Grogin tossed me the book *Games People Play*, saying, "This is something that will interest you." I looked at it, saw the title, flipped through the pages, and noted the geometric diagrams, wondering what esoteric circles they referred to. Since none of my favorite games—such as running, basketball, hockey, table tennis, soccer, and bridge—were included in the book, I tossed it back to Kevin with the comment, "Thanks Kev, but this is not my line."

The next scene is Lafayette, California, and the year is 1972. In a workshop with Muriel and John James I was being introduced to game analysis. Frankly, I could make neither head nor tail of it, but other parts of the presentation were enough to make me come back for more. Some glimmering clarity about games dawned on me at the end of the fourth day of the workshop after a long-haired blonde suddenly came into the training room and wailed, "I have to get down to BART" (the local public transit system). Immediately, Tom, Dick, and Harry jumped up saying, "I'll take you." I expected the young woman to be happy, but instead she looked disappointed. Glancing toward another participant she replied, "Oh, I thought that Simon would take me." A languid fellow sitting on my right looked up and said,

“No way.” She then repeated plaintively, “I have to get down to BART,” to which Harry gallantly responded, “Let me help you.” Resigned to her fate, she said, “Oh, okay,” making a wide gesture as though bestowing a great gift on him. Off they went, and curious neophyte that I was, I intuited that right there in front of me the game dynamic we were studying had come alive.

But that was not the end. A short while later a crestfallen Harry returned and Tom asked, “How did it go, Harry?” “All the way down to the station she complained that she might be late for the train, so I went as fast as I could. When we got there, she opened the door and jumped out, saying, “I hope the train hasn’t come.” She left the door open and didn’t even say thank you.” “You poor guy,” said Dick. With my little knowledge, I guessed that the young woman had begun with a play of “Do Me Something.” The three men then played some form of “Good Joe.” Harry had probably played “Very Good Joe” combined with “I Was Only Trying to Help” and a dash of “Poor Me,” to which Tom and Dick responded appropriately.

Game analysis remained a mystery for me at that time, although I did recognize in the workshop incident that something had taken place below what appeared on the surface. Secret messages were hidden beneath the open messages, and there were some negative feelings at the end of the whole event. As the days went by, I decided to spend time, effort, and money on discovering more about games. And I have continued to do so for the past 28 years, in what has been an enriching journey. I realized that game analysis provided me with a new concept that fostered honesty in relationships, integrity in social engagement, and efficiency as a psychotherapist.

Today, for me as a transactional analysis therapist and trainer, the unspoken, underground communication analysis is still important in helping people discover their real psychodynamics and hidden intentions and to take charge of their lives and clean up their relationships. The concept of transactional games also holds a central position in my personal life and

pastoral work. I have gradually come to connect the cleaning up of a person’s game dynamics with the Christian psychotheological process of justification. The concept of sin has been a controversial topic in Christian pastoral counseling. Through understanding games I have helped spiritual pilgrims of various faiths identify unconscious evil that they had accepted and come to a new understanding of forgiveness, repentance, and holiness. In my opinion, without game analysis, transactional analysts can produce clients whose therapeutic journey ends in arrogance and grandiosity rather than in nurturance and fellowship.

Toward Conscious Control

Games of one sort or another have been played and analyzed throughout the ages. Sometimes they are straightforward, with a set of rules for players to follow that identify the path to winning the game. Psychological games—some conscious and some unconscious—have similar open rules but also hidden rules. Such games involve conscious manipulations by some players that lead to “triumph” over other “innocent” persons, and they have added spice to many a story or play.

The psychological games that Berne discovered were primarily specific sequences of double messages that people indulged in without recognizing the consequences to themselves and others. Because of them, individuals felt that they were dragged into unexpected tragic outcomes over which they had no control because they could not see how they had landed in such a mess. Berne’s discoveries gave people a vision of how to avoid bad outcomes and how to predict and ensure good ones by surfacing the underground and unspoken dynamics in relationships.

Berne (1964) identified “dynamic qualities” of games as contrasted with “static attitudes which arise from taking a position” (p. 49). Games could be deliberate and “consciously planned with professional precision under Adult control to yield the maximum gains—the big ‘con games’ which flourished in the early 1900’s are hard to surpass for detailed practical planning and psychological virtuosity” (p.

49). He went on to identify the unconscious dynamics of games and kept this aspect as his main focus: "What we are concerned with . . . are the unconscious games played by innocent people engaged in duplex transactions of which they are not fully aware, and which form the most important aspect of social life all over the world" (p. 49).

The goal in helping clients to analyze their games is for them to bring unconscious game dynamics into conscious control and so avoid tragic outcomes. Through rational decisions, game players have the choice of continuing the game playing and accepting the consequences or finding a reasonable option for each step of the game so as to live happier lives and nourish loving relationships.

Ulterior Communication

Prior to his discovery of transactional game analysis, Berne (1953/1977a) had studied communication theory. He knew that in the communication engineering of his day, a major goal was to purify the signal and delete as much of the noise as possible. He also realized that the reception of the signal depended ultimately on the receiver, not on the sender. As a therapist, he recognized that frequently communication between individuals contained hidden messages and that these were of more consequence than the spoken or open messages. "In the case of interpersonal relationships, in general, intended, precise, formal, rational, verbal communications are of less value than inadvertent, ambiguous, informal, nonrational, nonverbal communications" (p. 57). Recognition given to latent communication had far-reaching consequences for bringing into conscious awareness the plethora of transactional games "played by innocent people most of the time."

Berne's (1958/1977b) first definition of a game was as follows: "A game may be defined as a recurring set of transactions . . . with a concealed motivation . . . or 'gimmick' " (p. 152). Later he significantly developed his concept of games by adding the conclusion as part of his definition of a total transactional game: "A game is a series of complementary

ulterior transactions proceeding to a well-defined, predictable outcome" (Berne, 1964, p. 48). The third step of Berne's process, at first embryonic, was his description of a switch in some games (Berne, 1963, p. 74). This concept of the switch became part of game analysis as a result of Karpman's (1968) insights on script analysis and role switches (i.e., the drama triangle).

Ego States and Communication Diagrams

Analysis of interpersonal communication became practical when Berne analyzed personality structure through three ego states, which he named Parent, Adult, and Child and diagrammed as three stacked circles. With this diagram he could create a visual image of how two persons communicate by sending signals or messages from one of their ego states to one or another of the second person's ego states. He used arrows or vectors between the circles to represent the signals sent and received, which he called transactions. Thus was born transactional analysis proper and the possibility of separating transactions that were simple from transactions that were complex.

In this way, straight talk was encouraged rather than interactions that involved games. The transaction is simple and straightforward when the message is open. It is complex when the open message is accompanied by hidden messages so that the communication proceeds at the social and psychological levels simultaneously. This early analysis of interactions gave transactional game analysis an important place in the creation of the school of psychotherapy founded by Berne. Straight talk led to simplicity in expectations, fulfillment of contracts, and successful endings. By confronting the games played between client and therapist, months and even years of wasteful therapy and training could be avoided.

In this article I shall describe the four stages of Berne's discovery of what constitutes a game. In addition, I will present several other methods of facilitating inner awareness. I think these methods spring from Berne's creativity as he conceptualized the theory of transactional analysis.

The “Yes But” Game

Stage one is represented by the first published transactional analysis of a game, which was of “Yes But” or “Why Don’t You, Yes But” as it is traditionally labeled. The person who plays it requests help or suggestions from others, but rejects them in sequence as inadequate and unfeasible. Thus the person offering the suggestions is discovered to be giving wrong or useless ideas. In diagramming this game, Berne showed that while the significant communication was from Child to Parent, with responses from Parent to Child, the ostensible communication was a rational request for and sharing of information from Adult to Adult. Scientifically speaking, this is Berne’s exemplar (Kuhn, 1962/1970) for game analysis, which took transactional analysis beyond intrapsychic analysis into the understanding of interactions spread over long periods of time; it gave these interactions a shape and a pattern, thus making possible real changes in human lives.

Through game analysis, the unconscious and unknown aspect of human communication became visible through the overt Adult-to-Adult transactions, pseudo-talk became identifiable, and the games psychotherapists play were visible for confrontation. The Freudian concept of resistance became real through uncovering Child interference in the social communication between therapist and client. Counselors now had a framework within which to understand “failures” in counseling as well as clients’ adroit dodging of their suggestions and solutions. The game of psychotherapy itself stood exposed, and Berne ushered in another revolution, one beyond his discovery of ego states.

At this early stage, Berne had not gone beyond the gamesmanship era during which games were identified by colloquial names. He had not achieved what I consider to be his own paradigm of a transactional game, nor had he gone much beyond emphasizing the two levels of communication (overt and covert) and discovering the surprisingly obstinate goal of “Yes But” (the Child taking sweet revenge on the Parent, i.e., “proving the big people wrong”) (Berne, 1958/1977b, p. 154). It was in

1964 in *Games People Play* that Berne gave a formal analysis of games that included a wealth of therapeutic material. At that point he moved from the original exemplar to a diagnostic model that included thesis, antithesis, and various internal and external advantages that show a link between psychoanalytic concepts and transactional analysis.

Amid the copious data on social and intrapsychic constructs that Berne (1964) provided in *Games* there is a unique model that describes formal game analysis. Called the “transactional paradigm” (p. 54), this model considers the historical origins of a person’s game, thus linking games with script analysis and rededication therapy. The transactional paradigm provides the key to many of a client’s contemporary relationship problems and also ensures the efficacy of social control contracts.

The idea of the transactional paradigm is illustrated well by a case example. An astrophysics professor named Brown felt burdened by jealousy he experienced from peers. In therapy he recalled that when he was five, his six siblings showed much jealousy toward him. Although his mother refused to protect him from his siblings, she did cuddle him for being a victim. When he worked through this issue with his mother—who at first refused to apologize to him for not protecting him—he discovered that he no longer collected victim strokes, and the burden he experienced with peers in his present life suddenly lifted. He was no longer so susceptible to their comments.

Another important element of game analysis at this stage was Berne’s emphasis on the role of the person who is “it” and from whose point of view the game is discussed. Although Berne regularly analyzed the game from one person’s point of view, he did not neglect the social context. This is important because games are often seen as involving two people, with the implication that they cannot be solved without both parties changing. The identification of the protagonist within each section of the game made therapeutic game contracts possible. Thus, the “Yes But” person can make a game contract for personal change even though the “Why Don’t You” person does not. Through

Games People Play, the special mission of transactional analysis in the world—namely, the integration of intrapsychic change with interpersonal change—was sealed. Berne's social psychiatry had taken an important leap forward, and after these discoveries about games, the relationship between transactional analyst and client would never be the same.

The Switch

A second stage in Berne's developing understanding of game analysis was his acceptance of the switch as described by Karpman (1968), who summarized role changes (as identified from the person's favorite fairy tale) in a person's script with his drama triangle. Later Karpman (1973) wrote, "Through popular usage [the drama triangle] became used as a game triangle" (p. 75). Berne used the switch to describe the transition from the familiar duplex transactions of the first part of a game to the less comforting outcome of the game by linking the two elements he had identified: the series of complementary ulterior transactions and the well-defined outcome. Accompanying this link is a change of emphasis in the "outcome" to refer to unwanted yet familiar feelings, also called "rackets." The switch had consequences for transactional analysis therapeutic practice as the games of "Do Me Something," "See How Hard I Tried," "I Was Only Trying to Help," and "Dr. Murgatroyd" were outlined. The change from the beginning of therapy when a client collects Parental strokes to transference phenomena had a new and simple explanation through the concept of games; this allowed such phenomena to be confronted and treated right away, without long, drawn-out therapeutic analysis. The "switch" of fortunes in people's lives could also be understood through games, and the "switch" from love to hatred in symbiotic co-dependent relationships could be dealt with in time to subvert tragedy.

The discovery of payoffs had further consequences for the special character of transactional analysis psychotherapy. Whereas sympathetic understanding and rapport as well as understanding of feelings and their expression

were given free play in some other forms of therapy, transactional analysts were now suspicious of supporting feelings unless it was clear that they were not payoffs in a game. Repetitious weeping episodes or anger work, anxiety patterns and depressions could also be understood from the game point of view.

Colloquial Analysis

Contemporary with stages one and two is stage three: colloquial analysis. Such games as "Now I've Got You," "Poor Me," "Harried," "Gee You're Wonderful," "Kick Me," "Stupid," "Let's You and Him Fight," "Let's Pull a Fast One on Joey," and "Alcoholic," to mention only a few, were discussed and applied to various situations. The names themselves were educative and functioned like therapeutic metaphors. While transactional analysis practitioners did not label their clients' behavior with the names of games, the overall pattern of the game could be recognized through the name and interventions made accordingly. Besides, games seem to be found in all cultures. Although an understanding of local idiom was necessary to obtain the flavor of games played by a given cultural group, games could be observed at many levels (e.g., in committees, families, local groups, etc.) around the world. While transactional analysis psychotherapy was seen as just one kind of technique, game analysis applied to everybody. It offered transactional analysis a standing in the public eye. Colloquial analysis led to the search for the many varieties of games played in the world and a classification of various transactional dynamics. Games at home, games in the marketplace, games in school, games in the office, games in the bar, addiction games, and even games at Christmas were identified. Although Berne (1964, pp. 187-189) named more than 140 games in *Games People Play*, another analyst claimed to have discovered more than a thousand (Cheney, 1978, p. vii).

Formula G as the Final Game Paradigm

Berne's (1972) final theory of game analysis, "Formula G" (p. 23), is stage four of the development of game analysis. His initial

theory pictured a game following the path of duplex transactions leading to a payoff, the two being linked by a switch. His practice of game analysis in groups focused on plays of an individual's game or games and the individual's transactional paradigm. By the time he came to the *What Do You Say After You Say Hello?* book, Berne had moved toward providing a theoretical base for transactional analysis. He wrote of Formula G that whatever dynamics contained the elements of Formula G was a game, and whatever did not was not a game (p. 23).

It seems to me that two game paradigms are to be found in Berne's writings: the transactional paradigm of an individual's game and Formula G, or what I refer to as Berne's game analysis paradigm. Both forms contain the traditional emphasis on personal experience in transactional analytic psychotherapy rather than on logical constructs. I vividly recall my frustration when asking for the theory behind what my transactional analysis trainers of the 1970s were saying, only to be asked, "What is your experience of this?" They refused to give theoretical explanations. The transactional paradigm is a report of the client's experience-cum-formulation of game transactions. The logical paradigm is a theoretical construct that locates game analysis in a theoretical framework—the explanation.

Berne's original paradigm—that is, his early identification of transactions used in the individual's game of "Why Don't You, Yes But," which he described in 1958—remained the core of what he called the transactional paradigm in *Games People Play* in 1964. In the latter he wrote, "Paradigm: this illustrates as briefly as possible the critical transaction or transactions at the social and psychological levels" (p. 70). In detailing each game, Berne separated the social paradigm, which highlights the central open transactions, from the psychological paradigm, which highlights the main ulterior transaction.

For example, the social paradigm for "Yes But" begins with a reasonable request:

Adult: "What do you do if . . ."

Adult: "Why don't you . . ."

Adult: "Yes, but . . ."

However, the psychological paradigm is Parent-Child:

Parent: "I can make you grateful for my help."

Child: "Go ahead and try."

Berne (1964) defined the transactional paradigm as follows: "The transactional analysis of a typical situation is presented, giving both the social and psychological levels of a revealing ulterior transaction. In its most dramatic form, IWFY [If It Weren't For You] at the social level is a Parent-Child game" (p. 54). In so doing, he illustrated the paradigm with fundamentally the same game diagram of a duplex transaction that he had used for "Yes But" in 1958. The battle between the Parent and Child was still the core dynamic of the paradigm. In the game "See How Hard I Tried," Berne (1964) described how the social paradigm of overt cooperation is matched by the psychological paradigm:

Parent: "I'm going to make you (get dressed) (go to a psychiatrist)."

Child: "See, it doesn't work" (p. 108).

The social and psychological levels provide the paradigm (Kuhn, 1962/1970) for all transactional game analysis. Awareness of the double-level communication and its context within a conversation, a negotiation, a relationship, or a life plan is the crucial factor in analyzing human communication and a major contribution to positive therapeutic relationships, training relationships, marriage and family relationships, and so on. It is related intrinsically to what Berne (1966) referred to as an individual's "protocol" (p. 302) and "the infantile or childhood prototype" (1964, p. 60). In this protocol "it is not just the imago of the self or the imago of the other that is internalized by this process but *the scenario* of the interaction between the self and the significant other" (Woods, 2000, p. 94). My understanding of this is that not only are the two persons communicating, but also, within this communication there is an intangible reality, namely, the relationship between the two, and this relationship becomes a part of the individual's personality structure.

I see Berne's Formula G as the ultimate transactional game paradigm because it includes the specific moves and dynamics of the transactional paradigm described in *Games People Play*. The con and gimmick, the response, the switch, and the outcome are all contained in and explained by the transactional paradigm.

The six elements of Formula G include the con, gimmick, response, switch, crossup, and payoff. The con and gimmick refer to the open and hidden messages and the response to the series of duplex transactions. The switch is the ending of the transactions and a move to the game's denouement. The crossup is the moment of recognition, and the payoff is the outcome. James (1976) defined the outcome as being negative and added a seventh element: positive strokes (p. 259). I have expanded this to include negative strokes, referring to them as Parental strokes because of the way people use their "misfortunes" (or outcome of games) as a favorite topic of conversation. This supports what English (1977, pp. 322-325) wrote about rackety behavior and games. Thus modified, Berne's paradigm of game analysis contains seven elements: con, gimmick, response, switch, crossup, payoff, and Parental strokes.

In terms of Formula G and in a two-handed game, the game analysis of each individual involves the identification of the con or bait offered by each person; the gimmick or (unconsciously perceived) appetite in the other for a specific communication supplied by the "it" and unconsciously perceived (or projected) in the other by "it"; and the response, which refers to the interactions or transactions that take place. The game reaches a climax when "it" observes or thinks that he or she has picked up a hidden message from the other and accordingly pulls a switch inside his or her head that then activates a complementary switch in the head of the other player. This switch is often externalized by some expletive or action while the player has a moment of *déjà vu* or crossup as he or she recognizes that "it has happened again." Finally, the person collects a payoff of some undesired (though familiar) feeling. This then justifies "it" in finding some parental

person from whom "it" feels that he or she deserves recognition or reward for what happened; thus the person's script is advanced.

Formula G offered further insights about the therapeutic relationship and the relationship problems of clients. The benefits of intrapsychic work with ego states could now be tested by noting several factors, including the reduction in game moves and the ability to identify one's con, gimmick, and response patterns in transactions. Cons from counselors or clients became warning signals of bad outcomes. For example, Parental strokes from therapists were a means to identify the therapy game, by which clients ended up bad in order to collect their diet of counseling strokes. Third-degree games could be intuited and presented to the client so that he or she had more choices in terms of making changes and achieving autonomy. Potency and clarity was easier to achieve with the tools of Formula G for those transactional analysis practitioners who chose to use them.

The Miniscript

In 1975, as part of my operations research degree, I wrote my thesis on a mathematical model of a single transaction; during this same period, I also became a Clinical Member of the ITAA. Subsequently, thanks to several excellent teachers at Case Western Reserve University and my own internalization of the transactional interventions of my teachers and trainers, I studied several models of game analysis. At that stage, my use of the word "model" referred to its general use in mathematics and programming. I related models to Berne's terminological grid (Summerton, 1978) and researched the complementarity of four models of game analysis, adding other models as the years went by. Each model was an enriching and alternative way to facilitate clients in recognizing their game dynamics. I recall working in a training group with a wife and husband who successfully blocked understanding and accepting their game dynamics over a period of several months. The transactional model made no impact on either of them, nor did the Formula G model, nor did the drama triangle model. But when they were led

through the steps of the miniscript model (Kahler with Capers, 1974), after “Yes Butting” each of the other analyses, their eyes opened wide and with a joint laugh they seemed to recognize their dynamics. Each gleefully related their moves and countermoves in a pattern of interlocking or complementary games, which they were finally ready to acknowledge. The miniscript fit this couple’s experience. This knowledge was the first step in their finding options for change within themselves and a renewal of their marriage relationship. I saw how intrapsychic and relational change went hand in hand through simultaneous use of the various game models.

Models of Game Analysis

In 1979 I wrote *Transactional Game Analysis*, in which I described several models of game analysis. These are linked with the players’ racketeering at the end of their game (see Figure 1).

Berne’s (1958/1979b, p. 150) initial model of transactional analysis illustrates and is useful in understanding the interplay of ego states as preliminary transactions take place.

Formula G, Berne’s (1972) last description of what constitutes a game, describes behaviors by the players beginning with the “bait” offered in the con, including the three dimensions of the switch and ending with the payoff. From this model, individuals can identify behaviors that support their games and decide to change their way of acting.

The Goulding (1972) model, as formulated by Bob Goulding and David Kupfer, focuses on the inner perceptions of “it” as he or she goes through the steps of a game play (open message, hidden message, answer to hidden message, switch, and payoff). This model leads individuals to inner awareness and helps them to understand themselves.

Kahler’s (with Capers, 1974) miniscript describes the emotions that players go through before they interrupt the game’s play (until the next time); this is when they go back to the unconscious pressures to find out what will make their parents proud of them (to quote Mary Goulding’s description of drivers).

Karpman’s (1968) drama triangle identifies social-level transactions and the roles taken by the players in a two-handed game, especially the switch by “it” from one role to another. Many find that this first step—knowing their favorite role—provides an opening for dealing with their games.

Schiff and the Cathexis School’s (Schiff et al., 1975) redefining hexagon presents a model that describes six symbiotic roles taken by people and focuses on the efforts of “it” to restore within his or her psyche the security of early symbioses (relationships) with others. This has been found useful in helping individuals to recognize from the quality of their relationships the damage they do through their games.

A non-Bernean approach to transactional game analysis was developed by English (1977, pp. 322-325), whose diagrams fit under the column of Parental strokes in Figure 1. She focused on the process of psychological racketeering in which a person exchanges strokes on the basis of complementary rackets. I see her contribution as confirming Berne’s work but with different words; it also supports the idea that a person may use the payoff as the entrance point into another game: that is, taking the payoff (racket) from one play of the game to a Parental figure with the presumed expectation (understood) that the Parental strokes are to be given for the racket presented to him or her.

A Social Dimension to Games

The following two models of game analysis look at the way societies, communities, groups, families, and so on, play games. They develop Berne’s (1963) ideas into the organismic aspect of human groups: When individuals act together in a group, they eventually form a reality more than a collection of the individuals. Shaffer (1970) wrote, “The difference between the *Law and Order Game* and the games people play is that the Law and Order game takes place between cultures—societies; they occupy the place Berne assigns to individual psychic transactions” (p. 41). While Berne (1963, p. 74) assigned Etiquette, Technicality,

Author	Duplex Transactions	Payoff	Parental strokes
Berne			
Berne	$C + G = R$	$R \rightarrow S \rightarrow X \rightarrow P$	$P \rightarrow PS$
Goulding			
Kahler			
Karpman			
Schiff & Cathexis			
English			
Shaffer			
Summerton			

Figure 1
Summary of Game Models

and Character to organizations as analogues for Parent, Adult, and Child in the individual, Shaffer assigned equivalents to communities and named them according to the groups he was analyzing, as for example, the white communities and black communities of long ago (see Figure 1).

In addition, three Indian authors have made use of Drego's (1983) Cultural Parent in their analysis of social problems or societal games (Banga, 1996; Chandramitra, 1996; Drego, 1996). All of these studies focus on both an individual's functioning within a social setting and as part of the social setting.

Summerton's (1992) game pentagon also provides a link between the individual and the societal. I have developed Berne's "Alcoholic" game and Karpman's role approach in facilitating individuals' functioning within a group's cohesiveness. The game pentagon has helped many people to separate their own intrapsychic roles of Persecutor, Rescuer, and Victim from the social roles assigned in the pentagon: Sniper, Savior, Scapegoat, plus Spectator and Stage Manager. A person may function as part of a social setting, shifting between the five social roles, without necessarily shifting internally between the roles of the drama triangle. The person who cannot separate the intrapsychic roles from the social roles will have difficulty coping with negative social environments, being especially vulnerable to being scapegoated because of his or her tendency to end up internally as a Victim.

I use the aforementioned collection of models both in clinical practice as well as in personal self-analysis. I treat the game models as logical patterns that become experiential when applied to a particular play of a game whether by an individual or in a group.

Game analysis involves identifying those elements of a person's or group's communication patterns when they interact simultaneously at two levels—social (overt) and psychological (covert)—and when they are unaware of this doublespeak (Summerton, 1993a). I give the example of a mother who described her confused understanding of what to do when she reasonably disciplined her son for improper

behavior and then later apologized for having done so. She recognized that her apology contradicted her discipline, but also that her son needed this disciplining. Using the drama triangle, she identified that she had been in the role of Persecutor, had shifted to Rescuer, and then ended up with an unpleasant feeling. She intuited that she had done something destructive to herself and her son. When she looked at the same dynamics on the game pentagon, she recognized that she had operated from the role of Sniper and then moved to the role of Savior, thereby neutralizing the benefits of her discipline. She identified that she could be in the Sniper role (an observable, social position) without also being in the Persecutor role (an internalized, nonobservable position). Thus the simultaneous awareness and separation of the intrapsychic and social roles was a source of clarity (Summerton, 1993b).

The Complementarity of the Intrapsychic and the Transactional

Berne (1970) wrote that "whatever has ego states is transactional analysis, and what does not have ego states is not transactional analysis" (p. 243). Hence, every model just described may have a transactional diagram to illustrate the game's moves and dynamics as shown in Figure 1. This is a vertical format for game models. A lateral format was described in *Becoming OK* (Summerton, 1994, pp. 123-127), in which I gave an example of one person's game plays in four ways—phenomenological, historical, behavioral, and social—that fit the four validating principles of Berne's conceptual grid. In the new millennium we need to do further research and reflection on the intrapsychic aspects of games. The decontamination of ego states via various transactional analysis therapeutic methods needs to go hand in hand with the analysis of individual game transactions and games played within whatever group, family, and community the individual normally functions.

By 1979 Drego (1979a) had already pointed out the use of Berne's (1972) terminological grid for validating games. I see that the same principles of validating (Berne, 1972, p. 411)

a diagnosis of an ego state (Berne, 1961) can be applied to the models for game analysis. Drego (1979b) wrote:

Behavioural validation of the Game model involves reference to words, tone of voice, gestures, facial expression and other body language. . . . *Social diagnosis* of Gamey behaviour using any of the models can be seen from . . . the way a person responds. . . . The *historical validation* of a Game is made when the person remembers that his/her parents had the same pattern, or recalls experiencing similar dynamics in childhood. . . . *Phenomenological validation* refers to the inner awareness the person develops of identifying the moment of the Switch, the unexpressed needs of the Rescuer, the hidden agenda of the Persecutor and the resistance of the Victim position. Inner awareness is of the Hidden Messages in the Goulding model. (pp. xvi-xix)

In short, it is not enough to "identify" games; they need to be experienced as psychic movements that are connected with real events and persons outside oneself.

On the one hand, Berne (1959/1994) wrote, "It is necessary to discard conceptual thinking and to experience instead by introspection the phenomenological reality of Parent, Adult and Child, and to validate what is experienced by genetic confirmation in the actual early life of the individual" (p. 9). I interpret this to mean that it is necessary to set aside conceptual thinking about games in favor of experiencing them within the interplay of Parent, Adult, and Child and relating these to the fundamental transactional paradigm to achieve autonomy and freedom, not only in the inner reaches of the soul, but also in the drama of group self-awareness and activity.

Berne (1959/1994) also wrote, "When it is noted that a patient plays a certain game, it will eventually be seen that this does not mean an occasional sally, once a week or once a month, but that the patient plays that game almost incessantly, hour by hour, day by day" (p. 9). I believe we need to experience our own games, not just identify, classify, codify, or diagnose

games in others; we also need to be on the alert to deal with their perversely pervasive and potentially harmful presence in all human communication.

To unite individual cleansing with group cleansing, several models and dimensions of analyzing games are needed. It is important to experience the movement of one's own self within the process of playing and to note the reactions of others. Phenomenological validation without social and behavioral validation can result in individuals who may be autonomous in their inner worlds and innocent of the evil dynamics they support in their groups and organizations. Social and behavioral dimensions need to expand interpersonal realities to the awareness and protection of the whole human race as an organism. As cyberspace creates new interconnectedness in the world, we can feel the growth of humanity toward an organic unity, and we will be faced with even bigger game choices as intragroup games begin within humanity as a group. We will be faced with a choice: be hooked into harmful games that appear to be the norm for functioning or to exercise a humanitarian ethic and preserve our human race in freedom and with open transactions.

Oswald Summerton, a Jesuit priest, trains people and organizations to use transactional analysis and is the cofounder of TACET Academy of Social Transformation. He has begun researching game analysis in its various dimensions. Please send reprint requests to him c/o TACET, 40 Tughlakabad Institutional Area, New Delhi-110062, India.

REFERENCES

- Banga, M. (1996). Empowering young women through permission cards. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 26, 78-83.
- Berne, E. (1961). *Transactional analysis in psychotherapy: A systematic individual and social psychiatry*. New York: Grove Press.
- Berne, E. (1963). Recent observations. *Transactional Analysis Bulletin*, 2(7), 74.
- Berne, E. (1964). *Games people play: The psychology of human relationships*. New York: Grove Press.
- Berne, E. (1966). *Principles of group treatment*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Berne, E. (1970). *Sex and human loving*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Berne, E. (1972). *What do you say after you say hello?: The psychology of human destiny*. New York: Grove Press.
- Berne, E. (1977a). Concerning the nature of communication. In E. Berne, *Intuition and ego states: The origins of transactional analysis* (P. McCormick, Ed.) (pp. 33-65). San Francisco: TA Press. (Original work published 1953)
- Berne, E. (1977b). Transactional analysis: A new and effective method of group therapy. In E. Berne, *Intuition and ego states: The origins of transactional analysis* (P. McCormick, Ed.) (pp. 145-158). (Original work published 1958)
- Berne, E. (1994). Principles of transactional analysis. In O. Summerton, *Becoming OK: Transactional analysis basic concepts* (pp. 1-10). Bombay: Alferuby Publishers. (Original work published 1959)
- Chandramitra, R. (1996). Validating the ethnic metaphor. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 26, 84-90.
- Cheney, W. (1978). *Don't you play games with me!: How to identify and deal with games children play against you*. Berkeley, CA: Randolph-Harris.
- Drego, P. (1979a). Foreward. In O. Summerton, *Transactional game analysis: Games since Eric Berne* (pp. ix-xx). New Delhi: Manohar.
- Drego, P. (1979b). *Towards the illumined child: An Indian study of ego states*. Bombay: The Grail.
- Drego, P. (1983). The cultural parent. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 13, 224-227.
- Drego, P. (1996). Cultural parent oppression and regeneration. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 26, 58-77.
- English, F. (1977). What shall I do tomorrow? Reconceptualizing transactional analysis. In G. Barnes (Ed.), *Transactional analysis after Eric Berne: Teachings and practices of three TA schools* (pp. 287-347). New York: Harper's College Press.
- Goulding, R. (1972). New directions in transactional analysis: Creating an environment for redecision and change. In C. J. Sagar & H. S. Kaplan (Eds.), *Progress in group and family therapy* (pp. 105-134). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Kahler, T., with Capers, H. (1974). The miniscript. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 4(1), 26-42.
- Karpman, S. (1968). Fairy tales and script drama analysis. *Transactional Analysis Bulletin*, 7(26), 39-43.
- Karpman, S. (1973). 1972 Eric Berne memorial scientific award lecture. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 3(1), 73-76.
- James, J. (1976). Positive payoffs. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 6, 259-262.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1962)
- Schiff, J. L., with Schiff, A. W., Mellor, K., Schiff, E., Schiff, S., Richman, D., Fishman, J., Wolz, L., Fishman, C., & Momb, D. (1975). *Cathexis reader: Transactional analysis treatment of psychosis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Shaffer, T. L. (1970). The law and order game. *Transactional Analysis Bulletin*, 9(34), 41-50.
- Summerton, O. (1978). The Bernean grid. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 8, 27-29.
- Summerton, O. (1979). *Transactional game analysis: Games since Eric Berne*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Summerton, O. (1992). The game pentagon. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 22, 66-75.
- Summerton, O. (1993a). Games in organizations. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 23, 87-103.
- Summerton, O. (1993b). Three-dimensional transactional analysis: The drama triangle and the game pentagon. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 23, 30-35.
- Summerton, O. (1994). *Becoming OK: Transactional analysis basic concepts*. Bombay: Alferuby.
- Summerton, O. (1996). The game spectrum. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 26,
- Woods, K. (2000). The defensive function of the game scenario. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 30, 94-97.

A Complete Reference Database to the Transactional Analysis Literature

TADATA 3.0 Now Available

This database includes about 13,000 keywords covering the *Transactional Analysis Bulletin* (1962-1970), the *Transactional Analysis Journal* (1971-1998), essentially all books (not pamphlets) on transactional analysis published in English from 1947-1998 (115 books), and 446 journal articles from the APA PsycINFO database covering abstracts from some 1300 journals worldwide (1967-1998), including 260 research article references to transactional analysis and 143 research dissertations. The system includes three search programs, all of which can output to the screen monitor, the printer, or to file storage. TADATA 3.0 is provided on two 3½-inch 1.4 megabyte disks in IBM-compatible format. Two megabytes free hard disk space are required. Standard price: \$60 members, \$70 nonmembers, which entitles the purchaser to register as a user and to obtain annual or biannual updates at a low fee. ITAA members whose dues are set using the TAlent system can have the price of this product prorated on the same basis as their dues are. For further information, contact the ITAA, 436 14th St., Suite 1301, Oakland, CA 94612-2710; phone: 510-625-7720; fax: 510-625-7725; email: itaa@itaa-net.org. Copyright © 1995, 1997, 1999 Theodore B. Novey, PhD.